

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement as inappropriate for the reasons set forth below. In addition, Applicant asserts that there would be no undue burden in examining these alleged three sets of claims, as the Examiner has defined. The fees for examination of these claims had been remitted in the filing of the national application.

In the Office Action, an election was required between two groupings of claims based on the assertion that these groupings are each directed to different inventive concepts under PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2. According to the Examiner, the claim groupings allegedly lack the same or corresponding technical features because each group is characterized by a different contribution that each invention within that group, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Applicant respectfully asserts that this condition is incorrectly applied to the instant invention because the identified groupings include common distinguishing technical features, namely each group includes the features of *a first circuit using a reference mask (claim 1)*, equivalently, *a first part of an offset dependent resistor structure created in the overlapping regions using a reference mask (claim 14)*, furthermore equivalently *a first part created . . . using a reference mask (claim 19)*, and *a plurality of numbs that interconnect the first part and the second part of the offset dependent resistor structure (common to claims 1, 14, 19, and 22)* and thus relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 and 13.2.

Applicant has reviewed the International Preliminary Report on Patentability (IPRP of Application No. PCT/US2004/0020573, dated 03-JAN-2006) hereinafter, "IPRP," corresponding to this national application. The IPRP noted no issues with a "Lack of Unity of Invention" with respect to the pending claims; the IPRP concurs with the "observance of this requirement is checked by the International Searching Authority and may be relevant to the national (or regional) phase. (MPEP §1850), Paragraph I." There is no compelling argument presented in the Office Action for restriction under these grounds. For convenience, a copy of this IPRP is enclosed, and follows the Remarks/Arguments. In addition, the PCT International Search Report (ISR) dated 09-MAY-2005 is included. The IPRP and ISR are cited in the included Information Disclosure Statement.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested, along with concurrent examination of claims 1-25.

The Commissioner is hereby requested and authorized pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136(a)(3), to treat any concurrent or future reply in this application requiring a petition for extension of time for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Please charge any additional fees which may now or in the future be required in this application, including extension of time fees, but excluding the issue fee unless explicitly requested to do so, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-4019.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 29-JUL-2008

By /Peter Zawilski/
Peter Zawilski, Reg. No. 43,305
(408) 474-9063

Correspondence Address:

NXP, B.V.
NXP Intellectual Property Department
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131 USA

CUSTOMER NO. 65913